

REMARKS – General

By the above amendment, the applicant has amended all the claims to define the invention more particularly and distinctly so as to overcome the technical
5 rejections and define the invention patentably over the prior art.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 112 has been overcome

The last O.A. rejected the Claims 28. Claim 28 has been amended to avoid technical rejection. Applicant requests reconsideration of this rejection.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 102 have been overcome

The last O.A. rejected the Claims 28 - 30 and 35 as being anticipated by Dowling (US 20050170824). Claims 28 -30 and 35 have been amended to avoid technical
15 rejection with Dowling. Applicant requests reconsideration of these rejections, for the following reasons:

- 1) The APs (fig.1, 20A, 20B) of the applicant's current invention is a complete unit having direct Internet connection 110A, and 110B
- 2) Dowling (fig.1) has a different architecture of wireless antenna (see to 112
20 the cellphone tower and connection) connecting to a group proprietary local equipments (115, 120, 135, 130) and then gain Internet access to Internet 122 and communication with server 125. According to Dowling "the first network connection 112 is a wireless network connection to a wide coverage area cellular network such as a wideband CDMA network"
25 so that the mobile unit 105 really is connecting through "cellular network" to the other equipment means (115, 120, 135, 130) and then to Internet. Specifically, Dowling [0027] "The mobile unit 105 is connected to a first antenna 110 which is used to maintain a first network connection 112. In one type of embodiment, the first network connection 112 is a wireless

network connection to a wide coverage area cellular network such as a wideband CDMA network. The antenna 110 is operatively coupled to an air interface and switching module 115 via the first network connection 112. In many applications, the air interface and switching module 115 is provided by a telephone company which provides mobile communication services. The switching module handles air interface layer operations to include access and handoffs among cells supporting the network connection 112. In the illustrative embodiment 100, the air interface and switching module 115 is coupled via a communications interface to a packet transport interface 120. The packet transport interface 120 is operative to couple information between the air interface and switching module 115 and other networks and servers. The packet transport interface 120 is preferably coupled to a network such as the Internet 122. In some embodiments the packet transport interface 120 performs registration operations to log the mobile unit 105 in a mobility system such as mobile IP or SIP. In some embodiments, the packet transport interface 120 also performs layer 3 routing functions for packet rerouting within the vicinity of the mobile unit 105."

3) Dowling has a completely different wireless Internet access architecture from the APs of the applicant's current invention. Dowling and the applicant's current invention are two different types of communication system involving Internet. Therefore the servers, applications, communication and the functions are all different.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 103 have been overcome

The last O.A. rejected the Claims 36, 37 and 43 as being unpatentable over "Dowling (US 20050170824) in view of Coppinger [US 6,934,532]". The base

Claims 36 has been amended to avoid technical rejection with Dowling. Applicant requests reconsideration of these rejections for the following reasons:

- 1) Referring to previously discussion, Dowling has a different system from the applicant's current invention.
- 2) The applicant has amended the base claim 36 to further differentiate the claim from Dowling.
- 3) The base claim has been amended to avoid technical rejection with Dowling, therefore the combination with Dowling in view of Coppinger as suggested by last OA no longer applies.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 103 have been overcome

The last O.A. rejected the Claims 32 as being unpatentable over "Dowling (US 20050170824) and as applied to claim 30 above, and further in view of Shao [US 7,093,028]". The base Claims 30 has been amended to avoid technical rejection with Dowling. Applicant requests reconsideration of these rejections for the following reasons:

- Referring to responds to claim rejection of claim 30, the base claim has been amended to avoid technical rejection with Dowling, therefore the combination with Dowling in view of Coppinger as suggested by last OA no longer applies.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 103 have been overcome

The last O.A. rejected the Claims 34 as being unpatentable over "Dowling (US 20050170824) and as applied to claim 30 above, and further in view of Dinkin [US 6,603,965]". The base Claims 30 has been amended to avoid technical

rejection with Dowling. Applicant requests reconsideration of these rejections for the following reasons:

5 Referring to responds to claim rejection of claim 30, the base claim has been amended to avoid technical rejection with Dowling, therefore the combination with Dowling in view of Coppinger as suggested by last OA no longer applies.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 103 have been overcome

10 The last O.A. rejected the Claims 40 as being unpatentable over “the combination of Dowling and Coppinger as applied to claim 36 above, and further in view of Shao [US 7,093,028]”. The base Claims 36 has been amended to avoid technical rejection. Applicant requests reconsideration of this rejection for the following reasons:

15

Referring to responses to claim rejection of claim 36, the base claim has been amended to avoid technical rejection with Dowling, therefore the combination with Dowling in view of Coppinger as suggested by last OA no longer apply.

20

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC § 103 have been overcome

The last O.A. rejected the Claims 42 as being unpatentable over “the combination of Dowling and Coppinger as applied to claim 36 above, and further
25 in view of Dinkin [US 6,603,965]”. The base Claims 36 has been amended to avoid technical rejection. Applicant requests reconsideration of this rejection for the following reasons:

Referring to responses to claim rejection of claim 36, the base claim has been amended to avoid technical rejection with Dowling, therefore the combination with Dowling in view of Coppinger as suggested by last OA no longer applies.

5

Conclusion

For all of the above reasons, the applicant submits that the claims are now in proper form, and that the claims all define patentably over the prior art. Therefore
10 he submits that this application is now in condition for allowance, which action he respectfully solicits.

Conditional Request For Constructive Assistance

15 Applicant has amended the specification and claims of this application so that they are proper, definite, and define novel structure which is also unobvious. If, for any reason this application is not believed to be in full condition of allowance, Applicant respectfully request the constructive assistance and suggestions of the Examiner pursuant to M.P.E.P. § 2173.02 and § 707.07(j) in order that the
20 undersigned can place this applicant in allowable condition as soon as possible and without the need for further proceedings.

Very respectfully,

25

/Franklin Zhigang Zhang/
Franklin Zhigang Zhang

30

4717 Spencer St,
Torrance, CA 90503
Tel: (310)901-2631
Email: endeavour@franklints.com
Date: 2007 May 18